

U.S.S.N. 10/605,733

6

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

81092183

MAR 05 2007**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schofield, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0167589. Claims 2, 4, 9 and 12 stand rejected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise contain allowable subject matter.

By the foregoing amendments, Applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter of claim 2 into claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 4-18 are in a condition for allowance.

Regarding the rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Schofield, Applicants traverse. Both claims 19 and 20 explicitly recite that the receiver receives a second communication signal generated from an object that is external to the vehicle in response to the first communication signal, which the Schofield reference does not disclose or suggest. Rather, Schofield only discloses an object sensor 176 that generates a signal which is transmitted and reflected off of nearby objects. See, paragraph [0091]. The object sensor 176 in Schofield is an infrared sensor or other type of distance-measuring device such as an active infrared sensor, an ultrasonic sensor, a radar sensor, or the like. There is no disclosure whatsoever in Schofield of an object external to the vehicle generating anything analogous to Applicants' claimed second communication signal which is received in response to the first communication signal. In other words, the object sensor of Schofield does not receive a communication signal from an object or a communication signal that is generated from an object. Rather, the object sensor signal of Schofield is generated from the sensor which is part of the host vehicle. There is no communication between the host vehicle and the detected objects in Schofield. Accordingly, the system of Schofield is substantially different than the system claimed in claims 19 and 20 of the present application. As Schofield fails to disclose or suggest at least this claimed feature of claims 19 and 20, Applicants request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

U.S.S.N. 10/605,733

7

81092183

Having overcome all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action, the Applicants submit that claims 1 and 4-20 are in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowability indicating the same is therefore earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 223-9500 if any unresolved matters remain.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.



Robert P. Renke, Reg. No. 40,783
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: March 5, 2007